

Date: Fri, 26 Nov 93 04:30:09 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1389
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 26 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 1389

Today's Topics:

Emergency use of modified HT
Mods for Kenwood T-50S
Odd Static Observed
TM-732A mods
Use of HT for Marine & GMRS

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1993 05:28:44 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: Emergency use of modified HT
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov22.224113.26129@newsgate.sps.mot.com> Jim Jaskie <jim_jaskie@tempeqm.sps.mot.com> writes:
>Subject: Emergency use of modified HT
>From: WB9VGJ, waco@cbnewst.cb.att.com
>In article <CGuno7.99J@cbnewst.cb.att.com> WB9VGJ,
>waco@cbnewst.cb.att.com writes:
>>As to the argument whether the ham that used the HT on the sheriff's
>department
>>frequency, here are the rules from Part 97:
>>
>>97.403 Safety of life and protection of property
>>
>>97.405 Station in distress

>>
>>So, it is certainly clear to me that the actual use of the HT is 100%
>legal
>>according to the rules. However, the actual possession of the HT capable
>>.....
>>73,
>>
>>John, WB9VGJ
>>
>
>
>
>Well, I've read several postings from ARRL staff members. But none on
>this subject. Does the ARRL actually do anything useful? Or is
>soliciting dues the most activity they do? Isn't this a case crying out
>for an *energetic* national amateur radio association to correct before
>it gets out of hand? Does anybody know where we could find such an
>organization?

Has anyone requested that they help? It's not the ARRL's job to fight
violation rulings made by the FCC. The ARRL can petition the FCC
concerning PROPOSED rules; they do a darned good job lobbying. But I
don't recall the ARRL interceding for a ham that's been NAL'd. This
guy just needs a good lawyer.

Concerning whether the ARRL actually does anything useful, I suggest
you study the history of ham radio and the role the ARRL has played in
preserving our wonderful hobby the last 70 or so years. The ARRL is
older than most hams. Besides, they put out a darn good magazine.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 25 Nov 1993 08:42:15 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!bruce.cs.monash.edu.au!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!
monu1.cc.monash.edu.au!maramis@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Mods for Kenwood T-50S
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am still chasing extended coverage mods for the Kenwood T-50S HF Radio..
Anybody Help ???

C
\

Rgds,

Jim Maramis

Date: Thu, 25 Nov 1993 17:52:51 GMT
From: newsflash.concordia.ca!hobbit.ireq.hydro.qc.ca!macjmh.ireq.hydro.qc.ca!
houlejm@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Odd Static Observed
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov25.062357.187@news.unr.edu> James Mueller,
jim@unssun.scs.unr.edu writes:
> The following is a description of an observation that I made initially
on 21
> Nov. 93 between 1300 and 1330 Z and also several times since. I would
like
> to see if others can (1) confirm this observation (eliminate the
> possibility that this is just a local noise source or receiver problem)
and
> (2) explain what it is!
>
stuff deleted...
>
> Has anyone noticed this before? Are these some sort of spread spectrum
> transmission? Over the horizon radar? (Definitely not the same thing
as the
> "woodpecker" that I used to hear). If so, what is the source? Who is
using
> it? Has this been observed on other frequencies? Does anyone know of
any
> information about this? Thanks.

I have noticed the same noise pattern on different bands. From the buzz
characteristic
of the noise I guessed it was power line noise but I could not explain
why it was not
constant across the band.

Next, I connected an oscilloscope to the audio output of the receiver.
Expecting 60 Hz,
I synced the scope to the line frequency. Effectively I had a stable
pattern of spikes
but more than two spikes by cycle of the line frequency like if I was
receiving noise
from two phases of the power line. No big surprise there.

The surprise arrived when I tuned the receiver across the band. The

position of a set
of spikes moved relative to the other set until they superimposed. Past
that point
the noise would disappear on a part of the spectrum and reappear further.
(I do not
remember the details.)

Can anyone can explain the phenonena? Meanwhile, I am going for a power
line noise hunt.

73 de VE2AEY
Jean-Marie

Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1993 00:41:50 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!nott!cunews!revcan!
rubicon!cowan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: TM-732A mods
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Thanks to all that responded.

73 de VE3OIJ

Date: 22 Nov 1993 22:03 PST
From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.mic.ucla.edu!unixg.ubc.ca!
erich.tribmf.ca!bennett@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <93326.174137MGB@SLACVM.SLAC.STANFORD.EDU>,
<MGB@SLACVM.SLAC.STANFORD.EDU> writes...
>I have seen various discussions about using the out of band frequencies
>on a Amateur band tranceiver for Marine, GMRS or other services.
>If a person is an Amateur, and also holds liscenses for other services
>can he/she use their amateur radio on those services. Is there a
>definitive authority or regulation cite which can be found to make
>such a determination ?
>
>Michael Barbitta KD60AY +

In Canada, and also in the US according to previous discussion on this topic,
transmitters used in any service other than Amateur must by type approved by
the DOC (in Canada) or the FCC (in the US) for that service (in that country,

too - FCC approval doesn't count in Canada!)

However, unlike the current thread re operation on a sherrif's channel, if you have a station licence for, say, the marine VHF service, you are very unlikely to be caught and prosecuted for using a modified ham rig on a marine channel.

Please note that I do not advocate the use of unapproved equipment. I use my TH77 as a second marine receiver on occasion, and if necessary would use it as a "lifeboat radio" in an emergency.

Peter Bennett VE7CEI | Vessels shall be deemed to be in sight
Internet: bennett@erich.ctriumf.ca | of one another only when one can be
Bitnet: bennett@triumfer | observed visually from the other
TRIUMF, Vancouver, B.C., Canada | ColRegs 3(k)

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1389

